



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Hibeh Papyri. Part I. Edited with Translations and Notes by BERNARD P. GRENFELL AND ARTHUR S. HUNT. With ten plates. (Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch.) London, 1906. Pp. xiv + 410. 45s. net.

In the number and antiquity of the literary papyri discussed, Grenfell and Hunt's *Hibeh Papyri* takes first rank among the fourteen volumes they have thus far published. One-third of the volume, which is reckoned a double volume in the publications of the Fund, is concerned with classical fragments, new and old, all dating from the third century B. C. Lysias and Epicharmus are represented among the new pieces, and perhaps also Sophocles (*Tyro*), Euripides (*Oeneus*), Philemon, and Hippias. There are also tragic, comic, and epic fragments even more difficult to assign. Not less interesting are the pieces of Homer, which present the strange deviations from the vulgate text previously exhibited by a few Ptolemaic fragments, notably those of Geneva. These are the occasion of a re-examination by the editors of the problem presented by these "eccentric" texts, with especial reference to Arthur Ludwich's recent treatise on the subject, in which he dismisses them as perversions of the vulgate, instead of being representatives of an equal or earlier type of text. From Ludwich's positions the Oxford editors dissent, pointing out that the increasing mass of eccentric evidence bears heavily upon his theory, and cannot be set aside as due to chance, while the currency, especially in inland Egypt, of non-vulgate texts prior to 200 B. C. must be freely admitted, whatever the age of the vulgate text itself. Grenfell and Hunt suspect the Alexandrian Museum of having had a hand in promoting the vulgate text to pre-eminence, if not of actually shaping that text.

Texts of nearly one hundred documents of the third century B. C., together with descriptions of half as many more, constitute the bulk of the volume. The first of these, a calendar for the Saïte nome, is of especial interest for its connection with the astronomy of Eudoxus, by a follower of which it seems to have been composed. Royal ordinances, legal documents, letters, receipts, and accounts make up the remainder of a volume extraordinary in consisting exclusively of papyri of the third century B. C. Three appendices deal with the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars, the system of dating by the years of the king, and the eponymous priest-hoods from 301-221 B. C. There are the usual elaborate indices.

The story of the finding of the Hibeh papyri gives an interesting glimpse of the papyrus excavator's method at its best. The Oxford excavators were drawn to the site in 1902, when a papyrus dealer came to them in the Fayûm offering for sale a mass of broken papyrus cartonnage. This, it was ascertained, came from the vicinity of Hibeh on the east bank of the Nile, not far above Benisuef. Thither the excavators shortly

repaired, and devoted to the site the three weeks remaining of that season, returning to it for a month in the following winter, 1903. The papyri published in this volume were derived from mummy-cartonnage in part purchased from the itinerant dealer, in part dug up by Grenfell and Hunt in 1902. Those discovered in 1903 have not yet been examined. The site had suffered much from indiscriminate digging, the necropolis having been largely excavated by a native dealer in 1895-96. From his finds, it now appears, came certain literary pieces, notably three non-vulgate Homers, purchased by Grenfell and Hunt in Cairo in 1896 and published by them in that year, since further pieces of the same rolls were found on the spot in 1902.

Hibeh has been identified with the Egyptian Teuzoi, but its Graeco-Roman name has not been discovered. Hipponon and Agkuronpolis are possibilities, and between them it is probable that the remaining papyri from this fruitful site will make it possible to decide. Meantime the disastrous consequences of leaving papyrus sites to be ransacked by ignorant natives (who usually throw away papyrus-cartonnage as worthless), combined with the results of less than two months' excavating, should so stimulate interest in the Graeco-Roman Branch that the operations of Grenfell and Hunt in Egypt, now given over for lack of funds, may be promptly and extensively resumed.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Sophoclis Cantica. Digessit OTTO SCHROEDER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. vi+86. M. 2.40.

Professor Schroeder follows up his *Aeschyli Cantica* by a similar metrical analysis of the choruses of Sophocles. Even those who are unable to accept the "new *Metrik*" will be glad to see its principles systematically applied on a large scale to the texts. These schemes are certainly less intelligible to the average student than those of Schmidt in Jebb's *Sophocles*. There is no space here to inquire what is their rhythmical meaning, and to what precise differences in *viva voce* practice they point. Are we to accept literally the scheme for *O. T.* 463 ff.?

τὶς ὄντιν' ἂ θεσπέπει -
 α Δελφὶς εἶπε πέτρα
 ἄρρητ' ἄρρητων τελέσαν -
 τα φοινίαισι χερσίν;
 { ~ = ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
 { ~ / ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
 { ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
 { ~ / ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Is there no hold or pause on ἂ, for example? Do the four short lines perceptibly break the unity of recitation, or are they written so merely to save space?

PAUL SHOREY